

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the November 15, 2006 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Amendment to the Drawings

The drawings have been amended herein to correct reference character 502 of Figure 5. In Figure 5, reference character 502 is changed to be reference character 102, which is consistent with the previous figures and the specification. A replacement drawing sheet is submitted. Applicant respectfully requests entry and approval of the drawing changes.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 7, 20, 33, 53-55, 58, 60-64, 67, 69-73, 76, 78-82 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087584 to Hung, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,318 issued to Rivette, et al. The rejection asserts that Hung allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for receiving an un-prompted identification, which is allegedly taught by Rivette. Claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung and Rivette in further view of the Freeze reference. The rejection asserts that Hung and Rivette allegedly teach each element of the claims except for transferring a document into a folder, which is allegedly taught by Freeze. Claims 56, 57, 59, 65, 66, 68, 74, 75, 77 and 83-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung and Rivette in further view of the U.S. Patent No. 6,725,228 issued to Clark et al. The rejection asserts that Hung and Rivette allegedly teaches each element

of the claims except for transferring a document into a folder based on attributes on the message, which is allegedly taught by Clark. Claims 10-13, 23-26, 36-39 and 90-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung and Rivette in further view of Clark and in further view of Freeze. The rejection asserts that Hung, Rivette and Clark allegedly teach each element of the claims except for transferring a document into a second folder, which is allegedly taught by Freeze.

The claims as amended are directed toward transferring a document to a folder based on identification of a portion of the document. The identification is performed by a user and is an un-prompted identification of a portion of the document while presenting the document, wherein the un-prompted identification is performed without requiring the use of a special identification tool. Each independent claim is amended herein to include similar language. Thus, in the present invention, the user simply identifies a portion of the document with a normal cursor, not needing any special identification tool. Once the user identifies a portion of the document, the document is automatically transferred into a folder based on the un-prompted identification portion.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests having an un-prompted identification without the use of a special identification tool. Hung, Freeze and Clark do not teach any un-prompted identification. Rivette does teach identification of a portion of the document, but only after the user has selected a special identification tool, a pen tool in the example given in Rivette. Column 45, lines 11-29 show that in Rivette, the user must first select a special identification tool, the pen tool, and then identify the portion of the document. Thus, the user must perform an additional action of selecting the special pen tool to let the program know an identification is about to be made. In the present claims, no special tool is required or used, and the identification is automatic upon selection.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96.

Claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39, 54-61, 63-70, 72-79 and 81-95 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 53, 62, 71, 80 and 96, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39, 54-61, 63-70, 72-79 and 81-95 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39, 54-61, 63-70, 72-79 and 81-95.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated February 11, 2007

By: /James T. Hagler/
James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502